LIBERTY CP:

A. text: [the government(s) of the aff] will implement a libertarian, minimalist state as envisioned by the Libertarian Party of the United States. I reserve the right to clarify and the status is what you want. **THE LIBERTARIAN PLATFORM[[1]](#footnote-1):** We, the members of the Libertarian Party, challenge the cult of the omnipotent state and defend the rights of the individual. We hold that all individuals have the right to exercise sole dominion over their own lives, and have the right to live in whatever manner they choose, so long as they do not forcibly interfere with the equal right of others to live in whatever manner they choose. Governments throughout history have regularly operated on the opposite principle, that the State has the right to dispose of the lives of individuals and the fruits of their labor. Even within the United States, all political parties other than our own grant to government the right to regulate the lives of individuals and seize the fruits of their labor without their consent. We, on the contrary, deny the right of any government to do these things, and hold that where governments exist, they must not violate the rights of any individual: namely, (1) the right to life -- accordingly we support the prohibition of the initiation of physical force against others; (2) the right to liberty of speech and action -- accordingly we oppose all attempts by government to abridge the freedom of speech and press, as well as government censorship in any form; and (3) the right to property -- accordingly we oppose all government interference with private property, such as confiscation, nationalization, and eminent domain, and support the prohibition of robbery, trespass, fraud, and misrepresentation. Since governments, when instituted, must not violate individual rights, we oppose all interference by government in the areas of voluntary and contractual relations among individuals. People should not be forced to sacrifice their lives and property for the benefit of others. They should be left free by government to deal with one another as free traders; and the resultant economic system, the only one compatible with the protection of individual rights, is the free market.

Competes via mutual exclusivity – this would certainly not include a living wage and the net benefit is the NC. **PLATFORM (2):** As respect for property rights is fundamental to maintaining a free and prosperous society, it follows that the freedom to contract to obtain, retain, profit from, manage, or dispose of one’s property must also be upheld. Libertarians would free property owners from government restrictions on their rights to control and enjoy their property, as long as their choices do not harm or infringe on the rights of others. Eminent domain, civil asset forfeiture, governmental limits on profits, governmental production mandates, and governmental controls on prices of goods and services (including wages, rents, and interest) are abridgements of such fundamental rights. For voluntary dealings among private entities, parties should be free to choose with whom they trade and set whatever trade terms are mutually agreeable.

Also DAs to the aff prove the CP is net preferable.

brightline for powers:

Only legitimate economic powers are those strictly addressed in the U.S. Constitution. **THE LIBERTARIAN PLATFORM[[2]](#footnote-2):** **All persons are entitled to** keep the **fruits of their labor. We call for the repeal of the income tax, the abolishment of the Internal Revenue Service and all federal programs and services not required under the U.S. Constitution.** We oppose any legal requirements forcing employers to serve as tax collectors. **Government should not incur debt**, which burdens future generations without their consent. **We support the passage of a "Balanced Budget Amendment" to the U.S. Constitution, provided that the budget is balanced exclusively by cutting expenditures**, and not by raising taxes.

solves war:

Libertarianism uniquely solves war. **NELSON[[3]](#footnote-3):** Continuing with the war example, another layer of removal occurs when third parties carry out the deadly attacks instead of citizens or politicians themselves. Consent for war would be far more difficult to obtain were citizens, the supposed beneficiaries of war, or the politicians ordering the killing, directly responsible for effecting their plans. Not only would large-scale war-making be a logistical nightmare for its masterminds and supporters if the burden of military service shifted to the actual people in whose name wars are fought, but so too would retaining the personnel to continue fighting over the long term. Government war-making is instead made easier by the fact that politicians have a professionalized standing army ready to act on command — no thought or deliberation required. Troops are literally prepared to fight at a moment’s notice. Given this convenient arrangement, government can garner more support for its wars among the citizenry since it has a professional warrior-class ready to send off to battle. The cost of war ends up being externalized. Were warmongers forced to put their money where their mouth is, support for war would look quite different. American opposition to the Vietnam War was a [stark example](http://0.tqn.com/d/classicrock/1/0/t/j/wewontgo.jpg) of what happens when the government enlists unwilling citizens to fight its battles. But now that the United States government maintains an “all-volunteer” military, such obstacles as existed with the Vietnam War have supposedly been put to rest. Each and every soldier is said to be voluntarily committed to carrying out the government’s whims. Common sense tells us what a [farce](http://original.antiwar.com/justin/2004/12/08/the-stop-loss-scam/) this is — how many soldiers would remain after one tour of duty in places like Iraq or Afghanistan if they were truly voluntary, at-will employees? The U.S.’s current drone war is the quintessential fully-removed-from direct-experience war. With drone warfare, the United States government has attempted to sanitize war for its citizens and troops alike. With no body bags returning home as a result of drone warfare, there need not be any concern about its other consequences. Drone pilots are said to have an easier go of it than traditional fighter pilots since they work from the controlled confines of an office. But despite the government’s attempt at a “cleaner” and more palatable form of war — that is, one that is shielded by an experiential block on several levels — seeds of dissent over the drone war are sprouting up everywhere. Even the drone pilots [have not been insulated](http://www.tomdispatch.com/blog/175842/tomgram:_pratap_chatterjee,_the_true_costs_of_remote_control_war/) from the anguish and horror of war, as the government had hoped. For many of these pilots, basic human empathy still manages to trump the government’s attempted experiential block. But strong experiential blocks still remain whenever war is removed by any degree from the people who create it (politicians) and those who support it (citizens). This is by no means a call to return to the draft. It is simply pointing out the subtle way in which governments makes war possible.

liberty cp bad kritiK:

Saying the judge should not vote for the counterplan because it is not realistic is the exact logic by which people discourage voting for third parties. It is thus the self-fulfilling prophecy that reestablishes the two party system, entrenches oligarchy and precludes any radical politics. This outweighs, turns and acts as a reason to reject the shell by demonstrating the sort of political education that is most valuable and explaining how radical departure has the potential to be realistic in looming crisis events. **STOLLER:**[[4]](#footnote-4)So, what is to be done? We have an election, and you probably have a vote. What should you do with it? I think it’s worth voting for a third party candidate, and I’ll explain why below. But first, let’s be honest about what voting for Obama means. This requires diving into something I actually detest, which is electoral analysis and the notion of what would a pragmatist do. I tend to find the slur that one need be pragmatic and not a purist condescending and dishonest; no one ever takes an action without a reason to do so. Life is compromise. Every person gets this from the first time he or she, as a kid, asks his or her dad for something his or her mom won’t give him. If you are taking action in politics, you have to assume that you are doing it because you want some sort of consequence from it. But even within the desiccated and corroded notion of what passes for democracy in 2012, the claims of the partisans to pragmatism are foolish. There are only five or six states that matter in this election; in the other 44 or 45, your vote on the presidential level doesn’t matter. It is as decorative as a vote for an “American Idol contestant.” So, unless you are in one of the few swing states that matters, a vote for Obama is simply an unabashed endorsement of his policies. But if you are in a swing state, then the question is, what should you do? Now, and this is subtle, I don’t think the case against voting for Obama is airtight. If you are willing to argue that Obama, though he has imposed an authoritarian architecture on the American system, is still a better choice than Romney, fine. I can respect honest disagreement. Here’s why I disagree with that analysis. If the White House were a video game where the player was all that mattered, voting for Obama would probably be the most reasonable thing to do. Romney is more likely to attack Iran, which would be just horrific (though Obama might do so as well, we don’t really know). But video game policymaking is not how politics actually works — the people themselves, what they believe and what they don’t, can constrain political leaders. And under Obama, because there is now no one making the anti-torture argument, Americans have become more tolerant of torture, drones, war and authoritarianism in general. The case against Obama is that the people themselves will be better citizens under a Romney administration, distrusting him and placing constraints on his behavior the way they won’t on Obama. As a candidate, Obama promised a whole slew of civil liberties protections, lying the whole time. Obama has successfully organized the left part of the Democratic Party into a force that had rhetorically opposed war and civil liberties violations, but now cheerleads a weakened America too frightened to put Osama bin Laden on trial. We must fight this thuggish political culture Bush popularized, and Obama solidified in place. But can a third-party candidate win? No. So what is the point of voting at all, or voting for a third-party candidate? My answer is that this election is, first and foremost, practice for crisis moments. Elections are just one small part of how social justice change can happen. The best moment for change is actually a crisis, where there is actually policy leverage. We should look at 9/11, Katrina and the financial crisis as the flip side of FDR’s 100 days or the days immediately after LBJ took office. We already know that a crisis brings great pressure to conform to what the political establishment wants. So does this election. We all know that elites in a crisis will tell you to hand them enormous amounts of power, lest the world blow up. This is essentially the argument from the political establishment in 2012. Saying no to evil in 2012 will help us understand who is willing to say no to evil when it really matters. And when you have power during a crisis, there’s no end to the amount of good you can do. How do we drive large-scale change during moments of crisis? How do we use this election to do so? Well, voting third party or even just honestly portraying Obama’s policy architecture is a good way to identify to ourselves and each other who actually has the integrity to not cave to bullying. Then the task starting after the election is to build this network of organized people with intellectual and political integrity into a group who understands how to move the levers of power across industry, government, media and politics. We need to put ourselves into the position to be able to run the government. After all, if a political revolution came tomorrow, could those who believe in social justice and climate change actually govern? Do we have the people to do it? Do we have the ideas, the legislative proposals, the understanding of how to reorganize our society into a sustainable and socially just one? I suspect, no. When the next crisis comes, and it will come, space will again open up for real policy change. The most important thing we can use this election for is to prepare for that moment. That means finding ways of seeing who is on our side and building a group with the will to power and the expertise to make the right demands. We need to generate the inner confidence to blow up the political consensus, against the railings of the men in suits. If there had been an actual full-scale financial meltdown in 2008 without a bailout, while it would have been bad, it probably would have given us a fighting chance of warding off planetary catastrophe and reorganizing our politics. Instead the oligarchs took control, because we weren’t willing to face them down when we needed to show courage. So now we have the worst of all worlds, an inevitably worse crisis and an even more authoritarian structure of governance. At some point soon, we will face yet another moment where the elites say, “Do what we want or there will be a meltdown.” Do we have enough people on our side willing to collectively say “do what we want or there will be a global meldown”? This election is a good mechanism to train people in the willingness to say that and mean it. That is, the reason to advocate for a third-party candidate is to build the civic muscles willing to say no to the establishment in a crisis moment we all know is coming. Right now, the liberal establishment is teaching its people that letting malevolent political elites do what they want is not only the right path, it is the only path. Anything other than that is dubbed an affront to common decency. Just telling the truth is considered beyond rude. We need to build a different model of politics, one in which people who want a different society are willing to actually bargain and back up their threats, rather than just aesthetically argue for shifts around the margin. The good news is that the changes we need to make are entirely doable. It will cost about $100 trillion over 20 years to move our world to an entirely sustainable energy system, and the net worth of the global top 1 percent is $103 trillion. We can do this. And the moments to let us make the changes we need are coming. There is endless good we can do, if enough of us are willing to show the courage that exists within every human being instead of the malevolence and desire for conformity that also exists within every heart. Systems that can’t go on, don’t. The political elites, as much as they kick the can down the road, know this. The question we need to ask ourselves is, do we?

You cannot possibly evaluate the flow in a non-interventionist debate given how late it develops, thus err very heavily neg on these issues given that I only get one speech to explain my arguments while the aff gets two speeches and the last word. Treat all new 2ar responses as at most defensive, as otherwise the 2ar just always wins with a new preclusive offense because I get no chance to respond while they can respond to any offense coming out of the 2nr. Prefer negative 2nr preempts, because I took a stance on how the judge should adjudicate late starting debates in the first possible speech while the aff just ignores the question in the 1ar after starting the new debate meaning any 2ar analysis on that issue is logically new.
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